

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

CASE NO. 25-CV-60872-VALLE

WILLIE JONES,

Plaintiff,

v.

BROWARD SHERIFF'S OFFICE, *et al.*,

Defendants.

---

**ORDER DISMISSING CASE AS DUPLICATIVE**

Pursuant to Administrative Order 2025-11, the undersigned United States Magistrate Judge has been randomly assigned as the presiding Judge for all purposes in this case, including entering a dispositive order, presiding over any trial, and entering a final judgment.<sup>1</sup>

This case was filed by pro se Plaintiff Willie Jones. Mr. Jones is no stranger to this District. He has filed several cases in recent years. *See, e.g., Jones v. City of Miami*, No. 23-CV-23024-RKA (S.D. Fla. Aug. 10, 2023) (dismissed without prejudice for failure to prosecute); *Jones v. State of Florida*, No. 23-CV-61386-RLR (S.D. Fla. Jul. 20, 2023) (dismissed for failure to comply with Court order to provide information in support of motion to proceed in forma pauperis); *Jones v. United States*, No. 20-CV-21214-KMW (dismissing § 2255 motion to vacate).

Because Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and has not paid the required filing fee, the screening provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) apply. More specifically, § 1915 requires dismissal “at any time” if the Court “determines that . . . (B) the action or appeal . . . (i) is frivolous or malicious; (ii) fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted; or (iii) seeks monetary relief against a

---

<sup>1</sup> Although any party may withhold consent and request that the case be reassigned to a District Judge, *see* Admin. Order 2025-11, pro se Plaintiff Jones will be able to request reassignment to a District Judge in the case that remains pending in this District.

defendant who is immune from such relief.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) (alterations added). Upon initial screening, the Court finds that Plaintiff’s Complaint in this case must be dismissed.

Mr. Jones has previously filed an identical Complaint in a case already pending before U.S. Magistrate Judge Patrick M. Hunt. *See Jones v. Broward Sherriff*, No. 25-CV-60696-PMH (S.D. Fla. April 10, 2025). A review of the record confirms that the claims in the case before Judge Hunt and the instant case concern the alleged events of April 1, 2025, and Plaintiff’s claim that he was denied access to the Court in violation of his constitutional First and Fourteenth Amendment rights. *Compare* case No. 25-CV-60696-PMH (ECF No. 1 at 1), *with* case No. 25-CV-60872-AOV (ECF No. 1). Mr. Jones has also filed an Application to Proceed Without Prepaying Fees or Costs in both cases, containing similar assertions regarding Plaintiff’s income, expenses, and assets. *See* case No. 25-CV-60696-PMH (ECF No. 3), *with* case No. 25-CV-60872-AOV (ECF No. 3). Thus, Plaintiff has filed duplicative Complaints and requests to proceed in forma pauperis in two cases before the Court.

Accordingly, in the undersigned’s discretion, the Complaint in this case is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** as duplicative of the Complaint in case No. 25-CV-60696-PMH. *See, e.g., Jackson v. Fiorucci*, No. 22-CV-428-JES-KCD, 2022 WL 3028056, at \*3 (M.D. Fla. Aug. 1, 2022) (dismissing § 1983 Complaint as duplicative); *Daker v. Ward*, 999 F.3d 1300, 1310 (11th Cir. 2021) (affirming dismissal of duplicative complaint as “malicious” under § 1915A(b)(1)). This case is also administratively **CLOSED** and all pending motions are **DENIED AS MOOT**.

**DONE AND ORDERED** in Chambers at Fort Lauderdale, Florida, on May 12, 2025.



ALICIA O. VALLE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

cc: Willie Jones, Pro Se  
11570 Royal Palm Blvd  
Coral Springs, FL 3306